

# ST. LOUIS CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

D. R. McANALLY, Editor.  
Logan D. Cameron, Manager.

Published for the M. E. Church, South.

TERMS: \$2.50 per annum in advance.  
\$1.25 to Ministers.

VOL. XXV.

ST. LOUIS, MARCH 19, 1879.

NO. 21.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Any and every man, who undertakes to perform this part of editorial labor, needs to be well informed in that particular figure of speech which rhetoricians term antithesis, and at the same time be possessed of extraordinary power in its use:

Because it illumines what is desired to be impressed upon the reader; and is altogether pertinent to the time and the occasion, liberty is here taken to quote from Cicero's second oration against Catiline, thus: "If we will but compare both parties, and weigh the justice and reasons of the one against the other, we shall find how inconsiderable our enemies are, and how easily it is to conquer them. For modesty fights on this side and impudence on that; here is purity of manners, there impurity; here is faith, there is fraud; here is piety, there is wickedness; here is constancy, there is fool-hardiness; here is honor, there infamy; here is continence, there lust; here in fine, justice, temperance, courage, prudence and all kinds of virtues are in confederacy and contending with injustice, with luxury, with cowardice, with timidity and all kinds of vices."

Is not this still going on, the combatants before us, the struggle constant and complete, victory not yet won by either party?

After all that has been said about the sects, in religion and parties, in politics, is it not true that the real contest of the world's mind and the world's pride and passion has been, and still is, a struggle between right and wrong, light and darkness, truth and error? Is it not that the right, the true, the good are, and ever have been, the great themes of discussion among the reading and thinking portions of mankind? Would a sane man contend for the wrong, knowing it to be such; or for the false, knowing it was false? The great difficulty then is to ascertain what is right, what is true and what is good. The mental, as well as the physical world, is characterized by antinomies—standing opposed to every good there is an evil, a false opposed to every true, and darkness antagonizing every ray of mental light—and how much thought, how much research, how much study, mental toil and suffering have there been spent and endured to maintain the one and overcome the other. Men are differently constituted, of different temperaments, experience difference in amount of knowledge, are amid different surroundings, occupy different stand-points, and often, in the very necessities of the case, see the same things with different aspects. Honest-minded men are much oftener wrong in what they deny than what they affirm. Like Saxe's six blind men, who went to see the elephant. One blundered against the side, and swore by all that's good or bad that the elephant was just like a wall, and like nothing else. A second, got hold of a leg, and pronounced the other a fool or a liar, the elephant was like a post, and nothing else. A third, took hold of an ear, and proclaimed both the others in error, for the elephant was like a blanket. A fourth, experimented by seizing a tusk, and ridiculed the folly of the three others, for he knew the elephant was like a spear. A fifth, got hold on the trunk and said all the rest were wrong, for the elephant was just like a great serpent. The sixth, tried his hand, got hold of the tail, and laughed and ridiculed all the others, for the elephant was like a rope, and nothing else. So it was, each one of them was right in what he affirmed; but sadly wrong in what he denied; and so it is to-day—in science, philosophy, politics, religion, and almost any and every other subject about which men think or write—but none ought not to assume that nobody sees any more of the matter, nor sees it in any clearer light than he does. This is assuming entirely too much, and is an error into which men too commonly fall. Things are, to us, as we perceive them. Our judgments and moral sense will decide according to our perceptions; they can decide in no other way, and if these perceptions be incorrect, false, then that which in reality is true, becomes false to us, because incorrectly perceived. On this principle we may account for much of the difference in opinion between men in regard to politics, religion and other important matters. Each perceives, according to his own power of perception, and from his own particular stand point and surroundings, and judges of the whole according to what he sees, be that much or little. If he perceive an object or a subject in its entirety, then, and then only, is he properly prepared to judge of it as a whole. But there are few who do this. Some view on one side, some on the other; and each forming his judgment from what he sees; there are many illustrations of the fable of the golden and silver shield, about which the knights fought so valiantly, as the boys read it in their school books. Then men differ in the power and habits of attention, hence there is always a corresponding difference in the powers of memory and recollection. The writer of this was once present in a courtroom in Virginia, and heard two physi-

cians testify to the location of a wound received by a man whose case was then before the court. Both were high-toned, honorable, truthful men, but of different temperaments. The first was cool, deliberate, calculating, rather slow in mental action, inclined to hold on to a subject until it was seen in all possible aspects. The action of the other's mind was quick, nervous, ardent, the train of perceptions passing rapidly, and the natural tendency was to take a hasty glance at things and pass on. Both these men had attended the patient, and the second did not hear the testimony of the first. The first testified that the wound was a little above and forward of the ear; the second was called in, and testified the wound was back of the ear. Both were honest, and both testified agreeably to their recollection; but the first, because of his greater power and habits of attention, was enabled to recollect more correctly; hence he was in the right. The other was wrong, stated a falsehood under oath, and yet that falsehood was physical only, and not moral. The affiant stated what he believed to be true, but the fault was, he had not given his attention to the matter sufficiently close to enable him to recollect it correctly. Thousands of like cases occur among men—honest men—in regard to almost all matters of investigation and thought. Hence we should all seek to possess and exercise that charity which "thinketh no evil." Ask any candid student, who has passed the meridian of life, and he will likely tell you that he estimates men and things very differently now from what he did twenty, thirty, or forty years ago. He learned something as he passed along, and particularly learned there are often many aspects in which the same thing or things could be seen, and that there are few men who see all those aspects.

Keeping these things in mind will greatly aid us in properly estimating the character and conduct of men, and lead us to understand and excuse much that otherwise we would condemn outright. It is true there are cases, alas! too many, in which the facts compel us to conclude that men deliberately and wilfully lie, but such conclusion should never be admitted so long as the act or conduct can be reasonably accounted for otherwise.

Now, in discussing questions pertaining to religion, philosophy, science, politics, or to any thing else, this paper has honestly tried to look at all the aspects of the case, and make all due allowances in the explanations of the conduct of men, and treat them fairly and honestly, and so, by God's blessing, it will continue.

At present there is considerable anxiety in the minds of the leading politicians of the country, caused, we think, not so much by the facts of the present as by misgivings as to what may be in the future. There are at present but few questions of federal policy that divide the two leading parties, and the difference is largely—not wholly—one of place and power, a question as to which party shall control the affairs of the federal government, and enjoy the benefits of the place, position and influence thus secured. Both well understand that this control is necessary to the determining those points about which they disagree, and those men, of whom there are many, who have no particular desire for political place or power, are now interested in securing such control as a means to a greater and more desirable end.

Congress assembles this week in extra session. As heretofore noted, last congress failed to pass several important appropriation bills, hence the call for an extra session which will likely continue during a considerable time. There is much at stake besides mere party interests, and the extra session may continue, if the members so elect, until the regular session next December. A majority in the house, on which devolves the duty of voting appropriations, took the position in the last congress that the test or iron-clad oath and the law providing for the appointment of supervisors of elections in specified cases, should be repealed, and declined, it is said, to pass upon the appropriations until this was done. They will likely take the same position in the extra session, and if so, there may be a serious hitch in affairs. A repealing bill may be passed, but whether it would be signed by the president is doubtful, and if not, a majority of two-thirds to pass it over the veto would not be found, unless quite a number of members should change their votes. There is, therefore, a fair prospect of some warm times at Washington, other than what the seasons may bring.

We think, indeed feel satisfied, that if the matter be inquired into, it will be found that the test-oath law was repealed by a Republican congress in 1871 or 1872, but why it was afterwards found in the revised statutes of 1872 or 1873, none seem to know, or, knowing, decline to tell. The repeal of the law, we believe, is admitted. Still it remains on that statute book, which was revised after the repeal. It will, therefore, be perfectly in order for some one to rise and explain.

The reports of some investigating committees will also be likely to come up for action, and, if so, let the members of congress be implored to examine them calmly

and carefully, act in reference to them with strict impartiality, seeking to do even-handed justice to all concerned, and not spend the time and discredit the country in mere party criminations and recriminations. Very probably it will be found that wrongs were committed on both sides; if so, let the fact be acknowledged, and the wrongs atoned for and corrected so far as possible, then let by-gones be by-gones, and all behave themselves properly in the future. The country needs peace and quietness, which it will not, nor can it enjoy without wholesome laws wisely framed and faithfully executed—laws and government for the whole body of the people, and not for any particular class, and least of all for a set of hungry office-seekers, many of whom lack either the talents or the industry to make a living by other means; and at present the fact is patent that many of the office-holders now in the country, especially those occupying offices of the lower grades, are men who have signally failed in other positions.

It is a principle in church polity that the man who can not, or does not, rule his own house well, is not fitted to rule in the church; and, on the same principle, we may conclude that the man who can not or does not manage well his own affairs, is unfit to manage the affairs of government. And yet we often find that very class of men the most positive in their convictions of ability to do so.

It has been said of a Western squatter who once sold a dog for a good coon dog, and, being soundly berated by the purchaser for imposing on him, justified his act by saying: "Well, I tried him and found he wasn't good for any thing else, so I thought he must be excellent for coons."

The reader may draw inferences, and make applications for himself.

The speech of Senator Chandler, delivered before the adjournment of last congress, in which a violent attack was made on Mr. Jefferson Davis, is being extensively circulated. We have been informed that 74,000 copies were ordered for distribution, besides the numerous papers into which it has been copied. We were a little surprised to see the speech, or the principal part of it, in the *Western Christian Advocate*, published at Cincinnati, but *de gustibus*, etc.

Why do not, or can not, some of those gentlemen who are so blatant in the cry of traitor, reply, or attempt to reply to Bledsoe's work, entitled "Is Davis a Traitor?" There they will find a wide field for the exercise of their talents and learning. But that field they have not sought to cultivate, and acted wisely in the declination.

The Missouri legislature has some serious work on hand, partly because of the mistaken or bad conduct of some state officials, and partly because of a desire for change, as expressed by different parties on different subjects. We have not space for the enunciation of either the parties or the changes desired by them. One, however, is a change in the marriage laws of the state, asked for by a number of Protestant ministers. One of their number was not long since mulcted in a fine for celebrating the rites matrimonial when one or both the parties were minors; and now the ministers ask that marriage licenses be hereafter issued by such authority as the legislature may designate, so that the performers of the marriage ceremony run no risks. This paper has said nothing on the subject, has no serious reason for objecting to the law as it is. The real question seems to be in regard to the responsibility in the marriage of minors, a responsibility that must be borne by some one, and the ministers desire to throw it on the shoulders of others; but, as they usually receive the best fee that is in the case, why not take the responsibility on themselves.

There are some city matters this paper will endeavor to notice at no distant day.

From abroad there was scarcely any news last week that would specially interest the majority of the readers of this paper, unless it be the action of the Canadian government in imposing a tariff on productions that enter the Dominion from the United States. This is a kind of retaliatory measure in which that government thinks it is entirely justified.

The flood in Hungary, referred to last week was much more destructive than at first reported. It is now said the lives of thousands were lost, and the destruction of animals and other property almost incalculable, while the suffering of the survivors among the people are exceedingly severe.

There is a report that the Burmese threaten to war upon the British people of Burmah, and the British government has ordered troops to reinforce their garrisons in Burmah. At the same time the British forces in Africa are calling for reinforcements, and there is talk of a forward movement of the forces in Afghanistan. So there is prospect for employment for British soldiers, if not for other classes of the people.

Turkey has offered to compromise with Greece, by giving her one-half the territory for which she contends.

Chili and Bolivia are at war with each other, and at the latest advices the advantages were said to be in favor of Chili.

Alaska, though not exactly a foreign

country, but might as well be so considered, so far as the United States has any use for it, or it for the United States, is threatened with an Indian war; and the report is, a British war vessel has gone thither to protect the few white people who are there, and will remain until the arrival of an American man-of-war. The situation is said to be very alarming.

## The Indian Question.

MR. EDITOR: In a recent number of the *ADVOCATE*, there was published a letter from a prominent Methodist minister, living in the Cherokee Nation, making inquiry of you as to why the church papers do not interest themselves more with the "Indian question?"

Answering for yourself you say: "Simply because we have not been informed of its status, and in the absence of such information, could not act intelligently."

It is for the purpose of giving you some facts connected with the "Indian question," as regards this territory, and thereby furnishing you some data upon which to found an opinion, that we write.

There is now a question discussed in this country in regard to the opening of the Indian territory for the admission of white settlers. This is the basis of the "Indian question" referred to in the communication above mentioned. It is not strictly correct to say this question is only discussed here, for it has reached the halls of the United States congress. And the reason is, congress is the only power that can open the country to white settlers. The right of congress to do this is denied; hence the dispute. You are, no doubt, conversant with the facts of the removal of five civilized tribes from east of the Mississippi to this territory. You will remember that, when the government had resolved to remove these tribes West, President Jackson recommended to congress the propriety of setting apart an "ample district without the limits of any state or territory then formed," for these Indians, "to be guaranteed to them as long as they should occupy the same." Acting on this recommendation, congress passed an act, May 1830, authorizing the president to cause to be set apart ample districts "for the reception of such tribes or nations as may choose to exchange the lands where they now reside, and remove there." This act also provided that in making these exchanges of lands, the president was to insure them that the "United States will forever secure and guarantee to them and their heirs the country so exchanged with them; and, if they prefer it, that the United States will cause a patent or grant to be made and executed to them." Now, in accordance with the provisions of this act, the country which the five civilized tribes now occupy, was surveyed and set apart. Also, the patent for the land was afterward made and delivered. Treaties were concluded between the government and the Choctaws, Cherokees and Creeks. In all these treaties the government possessed these tribes with certain described districts, and by patent granted the same in fee simple to them and their descendants as long as they should live on them. Subsequent treaties provided for the expulsion of all intruders on this country. By treaty stipulations they were secured in governments of their own choice, and their tribal distinctions were to be preserved. For forty years these tribes have occupied this country, have had their governments, have preserved their tribal relations, and all this with the well-founded belief that it is their country. They have cleared, fenced and cultivated farms, built churches, school-houses and towns, and have become a civilized, enlightened, progressive, prosperous and happy people. They have accomplished all this against great odds. But patiently have their leaders toiled on, surmounting difficulty after difficulty, believing all the while that they would forever be undisturbed. They rest on the pledges of the government as expressed in the treaties. We have recited some of the stipulations of these treaties; and now we have to say that we know of no subsequent treaty that renders void these stipulations. But, on the contrary, all we do know of confirm the first treaty on the tenure of the Indian title to these lands.

Hence, we said that the right of congress to destroy titles, and to admit citizens of the United States in this territory is denied. We leave it for you to say whether it would be right for congress to do this. This writer does not believe congress will be so unjust to the Indians. But there are many arguments brought forward by those who want the Indian title destroyed.

But we listen to no argument where the question of right is involved. These people hold these lands by right, and in the absence of their consent it would be wrong to dispossess them. It must be a matter of humility to these people to see their undisputed right to a continent dwindle down to a few thousand square miles, and their right to that questioned.

But, Mr. Editor, we do not wish to be burdensome. At the earliest possible period we will present you with another view of the question. May you and the *ADVOCATE* continue to be prosperous.

Very truly,  
E. W. BRODIE.

REMARKS—Your statement, dear sir, is

in perfect accordance with my recollection of the case, but, in a matter of such importance, I thought it not best to depend upon memory, and not having the authoritative documents at hand, wrote as I did. Unless there are aspects in the case which neither you nor I perceive, to deprive the Indians of their country would be an act of perfidy, disgraceful even to savages, and much more to civilized and professedly Christian people. There are solemn treaties—covenants—in which honor, honesty, justice, truth and right are all involved, and neither party can be absolved without the free and full consent of the other. But I forbear commenting at length until your promised letter shall have been received. For the above letter and the one promised, I thank you most heartily. Be assured, sir, while God lets me live and conduct this or any other public paper, it shall be conducted in the cause of right and justice, and the rights of the Indian shall be as highly respected and as earnestly defended as the rights of the United States congress, and, by God's help, neither "fear, favor nor affection" shall cause me to swerve from the right. Respectfully,

ED. ADV.

## FROM LOUISIANA.

MR. EDITOR: Whilst editors have much trouble in preparing the manuscript of their correspondents for the press, the correspondents themselves are frequently astonished beyond measure at what the types make them say. In my communication of February 6, several glaring errors appear. Liff Foster should be Tiff Foster, Thicot should be Picot, diffault should be difficult; in the last paragraph, "did well" should be died well; my own name is too well known to need correcting. This lesson has been learned: A manuscript can never be written too plainly for the compositors.

Why is it that many northern and western papers will persist in publishing articles in which they give credence to the absurd stories of Hewitt and Lowery concerning the existence of yellow fever in New Orleans? Is it done with the view of acquiring the unenviable reputation of robbing the most important commercial city in the southwest of its legitimate trade, or to make known their deep and unconquerable propensity for falsehood at the expense of truth and honesty. It is sufficiently alarming to have it in our midst, "walking in darkness and staying at noon-day," without creating any unnecessary apprehensions of it. We are gratified to know we have none of it now, and after such a cold winter, which must have destroyed the last vestige of it, we hope to escape for the present year.

Mardi Gras is a great festival in New Orleans, and in some towns of little note in Southwest Louisiana. This relic of the dark ages is complete when it has a king, a grand procession, and a masquerade ball. In the towns the people are generally contented with a masquerade ball, without the king and procession, though sometimes all are witnessed by spectators; but in the great Crescent City it is gotten up in the greatest perfection. Such an occasion draws multitudes of people of all classes from their pleasant homes and daily avocations, that they may be present at the gaudy pageantry of King Momus, and to indulge in debauchery of almost every type. Society is thus corrupted, rectitude of character is smilingly surrendered, principle, the grand fortification of moral character, is recklessly compromised, money is lost and won, by methods only known to the inventive genius of man, and life, the gift we prize most, is willfully placed in jeopardy, and sometimes, as a result of it, is lost. Four men, laborers from the mills located on the other side of our lake, attended the last here, they drank to excess, and at night in returning home unluckily turned over their skiff, and three of them were drowned, while the fourth barely escaped with his life. Who must bear this sin? It must lie at the door of the actors in this festival. King Momus, in his recent proclamation, assures his subjects that his "sympathies were with them in their sufferings and trials," during the yellow fever; that he believed that his presence would "tend to dispel the gloom caused by their late afflictions;" and that his visit, by drawing "thousands of visitors within their gates, and by putting once more in motion the wheels of trade," would dispense, in no stinted measure, "prosperity and happiness." Deep and solemn impressions were made upon the minds of the people, by the visitation of this dreadful scourge; they realized that they could not escape the terrors of the last enemy; they felt that they were in the hands of an omnipotent God, to be dealt with as he judged best; and now for a proclamation coming from such a source, reveals a heartlessness which seems to be

a solemn trifling with God and his providence, not to say any thing of the deep-seated malignity of a fallen nature, which seeks to break the force of the divine administration. Death entered the households of multitudes; it laid its rude hand upon the inmates and hurried them to the grave; it left the sacred ties of the family hopelessly broken; and now this proclamation vainly attempts to heal over the deep affliction of mind, still fresh from last summer's general calamity, by pouring into the heart, not a balm fresh with the divine baptism, but an unmixed earthly pleasure which is entirely destitute of reverence for God, and the power to soothe the sorrows of the bereaved. Does not this look like sporting with the feelings and sympathies of those who weep over buried treasures, and does it not make the bitter cup of broken hearts still more bitter? This stealing the "livery of heaven to serve the devil in" comes from the moral insanity of those who are "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God." By Christians this relic of Romanism, and the Catholic church, should be studiously avoided. The people of Memphis have too much respect for the Creator of the universe, and for their buried dead, to celebrate this festival this season. For this they deserve the commendation of all sensible and upright people.

"A large number of our preachers discourage the profession of sanctification," writes one of our preachers to *The Way of Holiness*, published at Chattanooga, Tenn. This doctrine is clearly, plainly, and explicitly taught in the Scriptures, and a belief in it, and the possession of it is the common heritage of all believers. And shall not every one profess it before men? Not unless he has it, and then, as Mr. Wesley says, "With great wariness, and with the deepest humility and self-abasement before God." Are we commanded to do this any where in the Word of God, or do we have any express declaration from any one of the apostles that he was sanctified, and where can it be found? Does Mr. Wesley, at any period in his ministerial career, make any profession of it. Is it necessary for the people, and the good of the church, that we should make it. "By their fruits ye shall know them," says the Savior. It is clear then that if we are sanctified the people will find it out, and if we are not they will find it out. "Let your lights so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven." We are to confess Christ before men, and in this confession the doctrine of sanctification is embraced, whether enjoyed at that time or acquired at any future period in life. That pompousness of profession for which so many contend does not agree with my notions of humility, as expressly and implicitly presented in the gospel of salvation. If we live devout and faithful lives, we shall enjoy it on earth, and the rest which remains for the people of God in heaven.

Our last session of the general assembly of this state wisely ordered an election for delegates to form a new constitution. The present one was framed during the war or immediately after its close. It does not meet the wants of the people in this great and growing state. It bears the marks of unwise heads, a spirit of bitter oppression and manifest injustice to those who took a part on the Southern side during the late war. Southern sympathizers have been held under surveillance long enough, the day has come for larger privileges, the omnipotent voice of the people demand it. The conviction now prevails that the earlier this sacred trust is executed the more readily will the people indorse it as the expression of their own will; and, under a keen sense of political deliverance they will abide by its articles with a tenacity which they have not hitherto exhibited; under such hopeful aspects the masses will settle down into that state of contentedness, peace, industry and good will which they have not realized since the war. Whilst the world grows better, it should, in a corresponding ratio, become wiser.

March 11, 1879.

## Good Omens.

"A friend" sends me the following note: "I inclose \$10 for the support of A. P. Parker, our missionary in China. If you think proper you may acknowledge the receipt of this in the *St. Louis Advocate*, but do not mention my post-office."

A few weeks ago a letter came from a former parishioner of Bro. Parker, inclosing a draft for \$50, being his personal contribution, which he believed would be faithfully used according to the best judgment of our missionary in China.

What a rebuke to the carping infidelity of our day, when amid these times when there are so many complaints of scarcity of money, Christian men so generously and unostentatiously give of their means to the cause of Christ. Surely, there is much vitality in our faith when our Master claims our first thoughts and offerings.

E. R. HENDRIX.

Fayette, March 13.

PEOPLE are not all made to suit one taste, recollect that. Take things as you find them unless you can alter them.